



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/741,025	12/21/2000	Satoshi Iwata	1614.1106	6272

21171 7590 01/04/2005

STAAS & HALSEY LLP  
SUITE 700  
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

BASEHOAR, ADAM L

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2178

DATE MAILED: 01/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/741,025

Applicant(s)

IWATA ET AL.

Examiner

Adam L Basehoar

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 September 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to communications: The RCE forwarded to the examiner on 11/08/04 to the original application filed on 12/21/00.
2. Claims 12-15 have been added as necessitated by the RCE.
3. Claims 1-5, 7-8, and 10-11 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Qureshi et al (US: 6,456,305 09/24/02).
4. Claims 6 and 9 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Qureshi et al (US: 6,456,305 09/24/02) in view of Iwamura et al (US: 6,388,684 05/14/02).
5. Claims 1-15 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 10, 11, and 15 are independent claims.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 15 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The limitation "improving document display.....on the monitor" fails to further limit the claim and appears to be merely a statement of opinion. The examiner suggests the above words be removed from the claim.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

Art Unit: 2178

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1-5, 7-8, and 10-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Qureshi et al (US: 6,456,305 09/24/02).

**-In regard to independent claims 1 and 10-15**, which are deemed to be substantially similar, Qureshi et al teach a display system and method of controlling said system comprising:

a display memory (column 7, lines 17- 54) storing processed document data (HTML document) so that the document was displayed on the display unit in accordance with the processed document data (column 6, lines 48-62);

wherein the system *determines the dimensions* (size and resolution) of the *display window* (column 4, lines 41- 45 & 52-54 & column 6, lines 31-35) related to the display unit;

a layout detection unit (browser), wherein the *layout data is integrally stored* (HTML markup elements within the HTML document (column 2, lines 40-55) with the document data (HTML document) and representing a layout data page of data elements that are displayed by a monitor such that the data elements are allocated on the monitor according to a display layout calculated based on the detected display specifications and the layout data (columns 4 & 6, 41-67 & 48-62) (Fig. 2-8 with respect to Fig. 13);

and a control wherein the document data was displayed as per the detected display specifications and the layout data (column 4, 53-67) (Fig. 2-8 with respect to Fig. 13).

Art Unit: 2178

Qureshi et al further teach wherein the layout data consists of data element identifiers (Fig. 12: "div id="SlideObj"), positional information of data elements (column 2, lines 45-55), and page format data (Fig. 12: 352 <div> tags) & (column 2, lines 50-55).

Qureshi et al and W3C do not teach wherein the method was stored on a computer readable medium as program code instructions. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to have stored the computer system method as a program stored on a computer readable medium because it was well known in the art to implement a computer system method as program instructions for portability of the embodiment of the invention to be used on multiple computer systems.

**-In regard to dependent claim 2,** Qureshi et al further teach wherein the respective position of the object automatically changes in proportion to the new size (column 4, 62-64), maintaining the positions as stated by the integrally stored layout data (Fig. 2-8 with respect to Fig. 13).

**-In regard to dependent claim 3,** Qureshi et al further teach wherein the entire document data was displayed on the display (browser) with an *original display size* (Fig. 2), where not selecting the resize image check box (Fig. 11) results in displaying the object with an original display size.

**-In regard to dependent claim 4,** Qureshi et al further teach wherein upon determination that at least one of the dimensions of the display window was different than the display space of

Art Unit: 2178

a page, a scalar relating the difference was *calculated and employed to resize and reposition the object* in the display space (column 4, lines 52-65) (Fig. 3-8).

**-In regard to dependent claim 5**, Qureshi et al further teach the display control method selects from a *first and a second display method* wherein the first display method causes the entire document data to be displayed on the display screen with original size and the second display method causes the *resizing of the dimensions of the graphical display of image objects* to fit the browser's display window (column 16, lines 14-16: Fig. 11).

**-In regard to dependent claim 7**, Qureshi et al further teach a *display screen* (Fig. 1: 47) wherein a *pointing device* (column 7, lines 59-61) was used by the user to select one of a *first display method* (resize the dimensions of the graphical display of image objects to fit the browser's display window) and a *second display method* (choosing not to resize the dimensions of the graphical display of image objects to fit the browser's display window) (column 16, lines 14-16: Fig. 11).

**-In regard to dependent claim 8**, Qureshi et al further teach a *display screen* (Fig. 1: 47) wherein an input device was used by the user to select one of a *first display method* (resize the dimensions of the graphical display of image objects to fit the browser's display window) and a *second display method* (choosing not to resize the dimensions of the graphical display of image objects to fit the browser's display window) (column 16, lines 14-16: Fig. 11). Qureshi et al do not teach a touch panel screen as a user input for selecting items. Qureshi et al do teach input

Art Unit: 2178

devices such as a keyboard, pointing device, joystick, game pad, . . . , scanner, or the like (column 7, lines 59-61). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, to have used a touch panel screen on Qureshi et al display to select items because a touch panel screen was a well known input method and falls into the category as described by Qureshi et al as a possible input method.

9. Claims 6 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Qureshi et al (US: 6,456,305 09/24/02) in view of Iwamura et al (US: 6,388,684 05/14/02).

**-In regard to dependent claim 6**, Qureshi et al do not teach wherein the display control unit allows an image of a data element with a calculated display size to be overlapped over a background image of the entire document data with original display size. Iwamura et al teach simultaneously displaying a calculated target region to be enlarged and its original image on the same display screen (column 2, lines 10-18; Fig. 1A-C). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to have used Qureshi et al system for automatically fitting a graphical display to the dimensions of a display window and combined Iwamura et al method for displaying a enlarged target region of an image overlapped over the original image, because Iwamura et al teach by enlarging a portion of the image the target region can be readily accurately recognized (column 2, lines 22-24).

**-In regard to dependent claims 6 and 9**, Qureshi et al do not wherein a user can select an image of a data element with a calculated display size to be overlapped over a background image of the entire document data with original display size. Iwamura et al teach a user input

Art Unit: 2178

means for pointing to specify an enlargement target (column 2, lines 39-40), wherein the result is simultaneously displaying a calculated target region to be enlarged and its original image on the same display screen (column 2, lines 10-18: Fig. 1A-C). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to have used Qureshi et al system for automatically fitting a graphical display to the dimensions of a display window and combined Iwamura et al method for displaying a enlarged target region of an image overlapped over the original image, because Iwamura et al teach by enlarging a portion of the image the target region can be readily accurately recognized (column 2, lines 22-24).

**-In regard to dependent claims 12-14,** Qureshi et al teaches wherein the display control unit calculates a font size of a displayed text data by using a font size list (minimum-maximum font size range)(column 5, lines 18-23) including an optimum font size for a maximum display resolution (i.e. calculates appropriate scaled font size for any resolution including maximum) read from the display specification data of the display unit (column 4, lines 52-67) and creating elements of the document data to meet said font size specifications (column 5, lines 20-22).

### ***Response to Arguments***

10. Applicant's arguments filed 07/22/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

-In regards to independent claims 1, 10, and 11, Applicant argues that it appears the markup elements of Qureshi et al are different than the Applicant's claimed layout



data in that they only stipulate element position. The applicant claims the layout data to be data element identifiers, data element positions, and page format data. The examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant, and wishes to point out wherein the three types of layout data are very broadly claimed. Aside from the above rejections the examiner believes other notoriously well known HTML elements listed in the Qureshi et al reference could be applied to the data types (i.e. angled tag brackets could be viewed as data element identifiers, any element spacing tag such as <p> could be data element positions, and finally page format data could simply be <font> tags that specify the way page elements should be formatted).

-In regard to dependent claims 6 and 9, Applicant argues that Qureshi et al fails to teach detecting a display specification data related to the display unit in combination of storing a processed document data. The Examiner respectfully disagrees with applicant and believes that Qureshi et al clearly teaches obtaining/detecting the size and resolution of a display window such as a browser (columns 4 & 6, lines 41-55 & 30-35). The Examiner also believes Qureshi et al shows storing processed document data in the form of an HTML document object as discussed above in the rejections. Wherein the processed document data was stored before it was manipulated for calculated scaling to fit within the display window.

Wherein applicant also argues, in regards to dependent claims 6 and 9, that the overlapped portion not be limited to reside in a position that provides a peripheral region adjoining the enlargement target as supposedly taught in Iwamura, the Examiner

Art Unit: 2178

respectfully points out that not being limited by said peripheral region was not in the claimed invention and as such is not a binding limitation of the claims.

***Conclusion***

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Adam L Basehoar whose telephone number is (571)-272-4121.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 7:00am - 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steve Hong can be reached on (703) 308-5465. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ALB

  
**STEPHEN HONG**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**